

CLASSICAL WEEKLY

VOL. 37, NO. 8

December 6, 1943

WHOLE NO. 984

THE LIBRARY
CONGRESS
SERIAL RECORD

DEC 28 1943

COMMENT AND CONJECTURE ON COMEDY

Description of Physical Characteristics in Comedy (*Hough*); By
Castor and Pollux (*Ullman*); Artistry in Lying (*Wilner*)

REVIEWS

PEARSON, Local Historians of Attica (*Boyce*); BÉRARD, Colonisation
grecque de l'Italie méridionale et de la Sicile dans l'antiquité: l'histoire
et la légende; PERRET, Origines de la légende troyenne de Rome;
Siris (*Bickerman*); THOMSON, Aeschylus and Athens (*Little*)

ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES

The new third edition of the famous

A History of Rome to 565 A. D.

By ARTHUR E. R. BOAK

For nearly a quarter of a century this book has been the standard text and reference in its field. It is now thoroughly revised in the light of the most recent archaeological findings. In addition, the text has been entirely reset in a format which makes it one of the handsomest texts published in recent years. It contains many new illustrations and maps.

Ready Dec. 28th c. 508 pp. Illus. \$4.50 (probable)

The Macmillan Company 60 Fifth Ave. New York 11

CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Published weekly (each Monday) except in weeks in which there is an academic vacation or Armistice Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas, New Year's Day, Washington's Birthday, Easter, or Memorial Day. A volume contains approximately twenty-five issues. Owner and Publisher: The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. Place of Publication: University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Printed by The Beaver Printing Company, Greenville, Pennsylvania.

James Stinchcomb, Editor, University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Franklin B. Krauss, Secretary and Treasurer, Box 339, State College, Pennsylvania.

Contributing Editors: Lionel Casson, Jotham Johnson, Eugene W. Miller, Charles T. Murphy, J. C. Plumpe, Bluma L. Trell.

Price, \$2.00 per volume in the Western Hemisphere; elsewhere \$2.50. All subscriptions run by the volume. Single numbers: to subscribers 15 cents, to others 25 cents prepaid (otherwise 25 cents and 35 cents). If affidavit to invoice is required, sixty cents must be added to the subscription price. For residents of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, or the District of Columbia, a subscription to CLASSICAL WEEKLY (or, alternatively, to The Classical Journal) is included in the membership fee of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, whose members are also entitled to The Classical Outlook and The Classical Journal at special prices in combinations available from the Secretary-Treasurer.

Entered as second-class matter October 14, 1938, at the post office at Pittsburgh, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 28, 1925, authorized October 14, 1938.

Volume 37 contains issues dated: October 4, 11, 18, 25; November 1, 15, 29; December 6, 13 (1943); January 3, 10, 17; February 7, 14; March 6, 13, 20, 27; April 17, 24; May 1, 8, 15, 22; June 5 (1944).

COMMENT AND CONJECTURE ON COMEDY

Description of Physical Characteristics in Comedy

In a drama actually presented on the stage there is little need for description of the physical appearance of characters whom the spectators could see with their own eyes. Nevertheless there are some 31 passages in Plautus and Terence in which descriptions are given, briefly or at length,¹ the content and placing of which lead to an interesting conclusion. They appear in most plays and cover the following items of the appearance of the type of character noted:²

Male

Head	big	servus (Pseud. 1218)
Hair	bald	senex (Men. 838); leno (Rud. 317)
	grey, white	senex (Asin. 934, Cas. 518, M.G. 631, Merc. 639); danista (Epid. 620)
	curly, wavy	adulescens (Cap. 647, Hec. 440); leno (Rud. 125); miles (M.G. 923, Truc. 610)
	red	adulescens (Cap. 647); servus (Asin. 400, Pseud. 1218, Phorm. 51)
	long	miles (M.G. 768)

¹Twenty-two other passages, some in close conjunction with those cited here, do not quite come within the limits of these observations. They include such comments as "how beautiful she is!" and "how strong he is!" facie liberali, honesta, and others noting particular qualities connected with local circumstances outside of physical characteristics as "how pale" (but only because frightened), comments on ribboned hair (married status), or prevailing modes of dressing the figure (Eun. 314). All such are omitted from this discussion, but for purposes of completeness and contrast, it may be here noted that they are equally divided (eleven each) between those with comic effect and those without it. Omitted also, because their contexts are impossible to determine are six references in the comic fragments (Naevius 49.2, Cacc. Stat. 95, 132, 268, Sex. Turp. 167, Novius 60; references to Ribbeck's lineation in Scaen. Rom. Poes. Fragmenta II: Comic.³ Teubner 1898).

²Merc. 639 listed as senex because this individual is, by third-hand implication, the senex Lysimachus; the hypothetical person described in Hec. 440 is undoubtedly an adulescens.

	bearded	servus (Cas. 466, Men. 854); leno (Pseud. 968)
Eyes	black	servus (Pseud. 1218); senex (Merc. 639)
	green	leno (Curc. 231)
	sharp	servus (Pseud. 1218)
	savage	servus (Asin. 400)
	bleary	adulescens (Hec. 440)
	one only	sailor (M.G. 1306); parasite (Curc. 392)
Eyebrows	crooked	leno (Rud. 317)
Nose	sharp	adulescens (Cap. 647)
Mouth, cheeks	large	senex (Merc. 639)
Jaws	lantern	servus (Asin. 400); senex (Merc. 639)
Teeth	buck	miles (Pseud. 1040)
	none	senex (Men. 864)
Face	thin	adulescens (Cap. 647)
	vigorous	adulescens (Rud. 313)
	cadaverous	adulescens (Hec. 440)
Complexion	fair	adulescens (Cap. 647)
	dark	servus (Pseud. 1218)
	ruddy	servus (Pseud. 1218); adulescens (Rud. 313, Hec. 440)
Stomach	weasel-colored	servus (Eun. 688)
	pot-bellied	servus (Asin. 400, Pseud. 1218); senex (Merc. 639); leno (Rud. 317, Curc. 231 collativus)
Legs	thick	servus (Pseud. 1218)
Knees	knock-kneed	senex (Merc. 639)
Feet	big	servus (Pseud. 1218)
	splayed	senex (Merc. 639)
Height	tall	leno (Rud. 317); adulescens (Hec. 440)
	average	servus (Asin. 400)
	short	senex (Merc. 639)
Build	burly	adulescens (Hec. 440)
	like eunuch	servus (Eun. 375)
Carriage	trembling	senex (Men. 854)
	shrunk	servus (Eun. 688)

Female

Hair	frizzled	amica (Truc. 287)
Jaws	big	tibicina (Poen. 1416)
Teeth	none	old woman (Most. 275)
Complexion	brownish	mulier (Rud. 422)
	natural	meretrix (Eun. 318)
Breasts	big	tibicina (Poen. 1416)

Legs	thick	inn keeper (Pseud. 659)
	limping	inn keeper (Pseud. 659)
Figure	barrel-shaped	inn keeper (Pseud. 659)
	firm	meretrix (Eun. 318)
	plump	meretrix (Eun. 318)

It will be seen at once that few characteristics are sufficiently repeated, or repeatedly limited in their application to establish a type. Only the bald or white-haired senex versus the curly and wavy haired younger men are consistently distinguished. Three slaves are red-haired, but so also is adulescens (but it was Philocrates in the Captivi pretending to be Tyndarus; where did he get the wig, if a captive?). Beyond these, there are a number of perfectly natural associations, but not such as to become stereotyped through application to a single type. Unpleasant characteristics are given to unpleasant people, such as the pot-belly, obesity, knock-knees, and imperfect features; age may be as toothless as white-haired. Nothing but the color of the hair distinguishes so clearly the conventionalized types as do the illustrations from illuminated manuscripts of Terence.³ All we can say positively is that unpleasant characteristics will sometimes become attached to persons who, though belonging to a type normally pleasant, are unpleasant exceptions to it, e. g. Merc. 639, a nasty senex.

What then is the purpose of these various descriptions? One (M.G. 631) is a perfectly natural remark relative to the age of a senex immediately following the affirmation on his part of his own youthful qualities, and serves no other purpose. But this is the only passage of the 31 which is as colorless and indifferent as the 22 others referred to in Note 1. Nine are descriptions for the purpose of identification in situations in which anagnorisis or unmasking of a deception, or mere identification, of an unknown person is involved. Although this would seem to place these also in the category of natural descriptions, the fact is that but

³The crass qualities attributed to Pseudolus in Pseud. 1218-9 are about as near as one can come to a type character. Three of the eight characteristics are easily paralleled in other slave, or low-born, persons (ventriosus; acutis oculis, cf. trulentis in Asin. 401; crassis suris, cf. crassam in Pseud. 659, also Hec. 440). For these reasons and for others listed below I cannot agree with Professor Norman J. DeWitt, who sees in this passage a reference to Hannibal's elephant Surus (CJ 36, 1941, 189). Rufus and ore rubicundo simply are not descriptive of an elephant; Surus as a slave name in comedy is so well attested ethnologically that it could not be considered a reference to the elephant (Menander, Georgos; Terence, Ad., Ht; Plautus, Merc. Truc. 405; cf. also Pubilius Syrus, a real person and especially Bacch. 649 as a type slave name); the really outstanding characteristics of an elephant, the nose and trunk, could have been included easily had the reference truly been in Plautus' mind (cf. naso acuto of Cap. 647 and dentatum, Pseud. 1040) not to speak of the notable characteristic of Hannibal's elephant, a broken tusk; finally, is it not special pleading to assume that Surus would be as well known to Plautus' generation as Jumbo was to our fathers? The art of the press agent is modern.

two of them (Asin. 400 and Cap. 647) serve this purpose only; the others are all so phrased or so placed in the context that a large element of humor enters into them, and overshadows the other function. These are Merc. 639, Poen. 1073, Rud. 125, 313, Pseud. 1218, Eun. 688, Hec. 440. Twelve passages are themselves funny, or lead to a joke based upon the physical characteristic described; in another nine, the physical attribute is employed as a scornful epithet which adds immeasurably to the lively and vivid nature of the passage without being necessary to the context; in five more passages color only is added, without scorn, but it is humorous color and, as such, worthwhile. Two passages, though containing small descriptive matters (only one each) are built largely on the theme of physical appearance, the mad scene in the Menaechmi and the toilet scene in the Mostellaria, and from this fact derive much of their humor.

Thus do the comic poets employ a descriptive technique for the achievement of humor, a technique which because of the nature of the dramatic genre is unnecessary as a descriptive mechanism, but which offers considerable scope for use in, as we have seen, several different ways, all furthering the comic effect.

JOHN N. HOUGH

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

By Castor and Pollux

It is known from observation and from a remark of Gellius (11.6) that *hercle* and its variants were used in oaths only by men, *ecastor* (*me castor*) only by women. *Pol* (*edepol*) can, it is said, be used by either. But Gellius in the same passage quotes Varro to the effect that men swore by neither Castor nor Pollux in the earliest times, but that gradually men came to use *edepol*. Did he mean to include *pol* in this development or does his silence imply that women continued to monopolize *pol*? Whatever he meant, it is a fact that especially in Plautus the men use *edepol* much more frequently than *pol*. Donatus (on Terence, And. 486) says that oaths by Castor and Pollux are suitable for women. Charisius (I.198, 17K.) says that it is proper for men to swear by Hercules (and other gods) and for women to use *edepol* and *ecastor*.

The figures below show occurrences in Plautus and Terence of *hercle* (HERC), *mehercle* (MEHE), *ecastor* (ECAS), *mecastor* (MECA), *pol*, and *edepol* (EDEP):¹

¹They are taken from A. Gagnér, *De hercle, mehercle, ceterisque id genus particulis*, Greifswald 1920, 106, except that the figures have been reduced slightly by omission of examples from the Vidularia and the fragments of Plautus. The text is uncertain in several instances and slightly different results would be obtained by following Lindsay for Plautus and Kauer-Lindsay for Terence instead of Goetz-Schoell and Dziatzko. Among earlier studies is that of F. W. Nicolson in HSCP 4 (1893), 99.

	Plautus		Terence	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
HERC	638	1	101	0
MEHE	4	0	2	0
ECAS	0	99	0	5
MECA	0	19	0	2
Pol	159	84	10	45
EDEP	338	26	13	10
Total	1139	229	126	62

Thus the chief men's oath in both Plautus and Terence is *hercle*, with *edepol* second and *pol* third. But in Plautus *hercle* accounts for only 56 per cent of the whole whereas in Terence it makes up 80 per cent. In other words, in Plautus it still has healthy competition from *pol* and *edepol* whereas this competition has largely disappeared in Terence. The women's oath in Plautus is first of all *ecastor* but in Terence it is *pol*.

In comparing Plautus and Terence Nicolson and Gagnér allow for the difference in the number of plays and lines of each, but both, in comparing the use of the various words by men and women, fail to take into account the fact that a much smaller number of lines was spoken by women, who therefore had a much smaller opportunity to use oaths.² A very rough estimate shows that in Plautus (twenty plays) the men have 6.2 times as many lines as the women, in Terence 7.69 times. In other words, it is necessary to multiply the figures for *pol*, etc. as used by women by 6.2 and 7.69 in Plautus and Terence respectively in order to get comparable data for both sexes.³ We find that if the women had been assigned as many lines as the men by Plautus they might have used 1420 oaths as against 1139 for the men. Terence's women do even better: 477 compared with 126 for the men. Does this mean that women had been emancipated and hastened to assert their rights, or that they had become more proficient in the art of swearing, or that the difference is without significance? *Sua cuique sententia*. Even the women's use of *pol* in Terence greatly exceeds the men's use of their favorite *hercle* (346 to 101), when the number of examples used by the women is multiplied by 7.69.

When it comes to the individual oaths, Gagnér, it seems to me, is right (and Varro is wrong) in ex-

²In the same way their statistics and implications about the frequency with which different characters (slave, matron, etc.) use the various oaths are valueless, for they have failed to note that some types have more lines than others. For example, Gagnér (108) indicates that in Terence *pol* is used 17, 1, 13, 13 times by ancilla, anus, meretrix, mulier, respectively. When we note that these characters speak about 202, 19, 268, 175 lines respectively, we see that the difference among them is not so very great.

³This is for all the plays together; the figures vary, of course, for individual plays. There are other ways of achieving the same results but this one avoids fractions and gives a clearer picture.

plaining the history of *ecastor* (*mecastor*). Originally it must have been used by men but became so weak from overuse that women could employ it. Its weakness and its feminization led men to abandon it entirely. But even the women gave it up eventually. In Plautus it still represents (in its two forms) 51 per cent of the women's oaths; in Terence only 11 per cent. It is found three times in the fragments of Titinius, a comic poet contemporary with Terence; after that it makes its last appearance in a single instance in Laberius, who lived in the time of Caesar. But we must not attach too much significance to that, as we have very little later literature in which women are speakers.

With the Pollux oath the situation is similar but clearer because the development took place in the period represented by Latin literature and all the steps are known. For some reason the one twin bloomed and died sooner than the other.⁴ *Pol* is used even in the early tragedy of Livius Andronicus and Ennius. In Plautus the Pollux oath represents 43 per cent of the oaths used by the men (14 *pol*, 29 *edepol*); in Terence it represents only 18 per cent (8 *pol*, 10 *edepol*). The women of Plautus used this oath 48 per cent of the time (37 *pol*, 11 *edepol*); those of Terence, 89 per cent (73 *pol*, 16 *edepol*). Clearly the men were abandoning this oath (especially in the form *pol*), while the women were claiming it as their own. *Edepol* was used more by men and less by women than *pol*, but was not so common a form. It disappeared after Varro. *Pol* was used by men four times in the Augustan age and twice in Apuleius, but *hercle* and its variants remained the popular male forms throughout Roman literature. The absence of *pol* as a woman's oath after Terence may be due to the small amount of literature containing speech by women.

For some reason Roman men did not think to strengthen their weakening oaths by swearing by both twins at the same time. It was left to moderns to swear by *gemini* (jimmy, etc.)⁵

The plays of Terence were produced from 166 to 160 B.C. In that short period one can actually see the trend in regard to the Castor and Pollux oaths that we have discussed. Of the seven Castor oaths five (including the only two in the form *mecastor*) are in the Hecyra, the second play to be written; in the last four plays together there is only one. For *pol* a table is advisable. The column marked CORR. results from multiplication of the figures in the preceding column by the equalizing factor for that play. The last column indicates the frequency of *pol* as used by the women; obtained by

⁴This difference in development is revealed in the forms as well: there are no forms *mepol*, *epol*, to match *mecastor* and *ecastor*. On the other hand, there are no examples of *edecastor* and *castor* to match *edepol* and *pol*.

⁵The New English Dictionary gives the date 1664 for the earliest example.

dividing the total number of women's lines in each play by the number of examples of *pol*.

Date	Play	<i>Pol</i>		CORR.	Frequency
		Men	Women		
166	And.	3	8	112	8
165	Hec.	3	12	46	15
163	Ht.	1	3	40	25
161	Eun.	1	13	36	22
161	Ph.	1	7	119	8
160	Ad.	1	2	58	16

Clearly the men used *pol* more often in the first two plays, though they spoke only 30 per cent of the men's lines in all six plays. No trend can be discovered in the usage of the women.

For *edepol* the picture is not so clear, but we are operating with numbers too small to be significant. The largest number of women's examples is in the Hecyra, but so is that of the men's, so that the women make the worst showing in this play. No trend can be seen.

Only a few of Plautus' plays can be dated with any certainty, though there is fairly definite agreement among most scholars about the periods into which the plays fall.⁶ In *Truc.*, known from Cicero to be one of the last plays, women swear 23 times by Castor and 16 times by Pollux; in *As.*, which all put early, the ratio is not unsimilar, 14 to 8. If the use of *pol* by men and women is studied, again no trend is to be observed: a high proportion of use by women may be discerned not only in the rather late *Bacch.* but in the early *Merc.* and *Mil.* In the twenty years or so of Plautus' activity there was, then, little change in the use of the oaths. Between 184, the date of his death, and 166, when Terence began producing, the change started and grew rapidly.

Charisius (I.198, 17K.), in preserving a fragment of Titinius, who was contemporary with Terence, indicates that *pol* and *edepol* were effeminate: Titinius in *Setina molliculum adulescentulum effeminate loquentem cum reprehendere magis vellet*, "An," inquit, "quia *pol edepol* fabulare?"

This brings me to what was really the starting-point of this paper. In *De Oratore* 277 Cicero says: *Ut cum Q. Opimius consularis, qui adulescentulus male audisset, festivo homini Egilio, qui videretur mollior nec esset, dixisset, "Quid tu, Egilia mea? Quando ad me venis cum tua colu et lana?" "Non pol," inquit, "audeo, nam me ad famosas vetuit mater accedere."* Opimius made fun of Egilius' supposed effeminacy by calling him Egilia and by asking him to come some time and bring his knitting. Egilius could afford to pretend that he was a girl, even to using the now

thoroughly feminine *pol*. This could not have been many years after Terence's time, for Opimius was ex-consul at the time of the story and he held the consulate in 154. The history of *pol* as we have traced it shows that Egilius' use of it was a neat added touch.

B. L. ULLMAN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Artistry in Lying

The comedies of Plautus are of course overweighted with lies—lies are the warp and woof of their fabric. But the first impression that the lies are all preposterous inventions told by devoted slaves to perpetrate an intrigue for a young master at the expense of his father, does less than justice to the fertile imagination and varied technique of the author. Granted that the bulk of the lies is told for this purpose, or to escape the consequences of previous intrigue or lying; subtract another large group consisting of the phrases "you lie" or "I'm not lying"; then consider the residue, which fall into eight categories:

(1) The liar discusses lies ingenuously, laying plots, congratulating friends, or boasting of his own victorious mendacity. The ingenuousness disarms reproach and wins indulgence from the audience. In *Asinaria* 545-55 Libanus gloats over the terrific punishments his audacious lies have rightly earned him. In *Pseudolus* 688-90 *Pseudolus* approves himself for his inventiveness, and in 943-4 he shows approval of *Simia*. Cf. *Bacch.* 832-73; *Capt.* 677-90.

(2) Persons are accused of lying, (a) in quarrels as a type of billingsgate; (b) by themselves as a joke or, negatively, as a mild oath! (c) in matter-of-fact descriptions with emotions not involved: *Amph.* 198-200; *Capt.* 285; *Curc.* 470-1; *M.G.* 88-90; *Poen.* 825-6. Most objective is that passage in which *Palaestrio* describes the soldier to the audience as *plenus periuri*. Most enlightening is the *Captivi* passage, where *Tyndarus* names philosophizing and lying as the two fundamental traits of a slave: *salva est res, philosophatur quoque iam, non mendax modo est*.

(3) The speaker boasts or taunts or flatters mendaciously. One remembers inevitably the first scene of the *Miles*, where the atmosphere of the play is created and the characters are revealed by this means, in part. Cf. *Pseud.* 804-46 for a cook's boasting; *Poen.* 470-86 for a soldier's.

(4) Sometimes the liar's whole purpose seems to be to amuse the audience, either directly, as *Curc.* 470-1: the property man addresses not his fellow actors but the audience itself (surely this whole scene is a throwback to the parabasis of Old Attic Comedy); or by kidding a fellow actor, as *Poen.* 1225-38: *Hanno* makes fun at the expense of the two girls. Cf. also *Amph.* 343-435, repeatedly; *Poen.* 364-7, where the lie consists in this,

⁶The most recent attempt at dating is that of C. H. Buck, Jr., *A Chronology of the Plays of Plautus*, Baltimore 1940, who refers to the earlier work of Sedgwick, Hough, and others.

that the slave's words express the master's sentiments.

(5) The speaker resorts to lies, often after insisting vainly on the truth, because the hearer rejects the truth, but willingly believes the lies: *Amph.* 381-4; *Men.* *passim*, esp. 417-21, 835-40.

(6) The lie is not actually spoken, but an action or a situation constitutes a lie, as happens in the intrigue of the *Captivi* after the exchange of identity has once been effected. Cf. *Cist.* 305-70; *Cas.* 832; *Men.* 565; and repeatedly in *M.G.* 368-452.

(7) The lies spoken in self-defense are numerous, but of special interest are those told so as not to be forced to give up property to legal authority or share it with a racketeer: *Rud.* 993-8, 1067; *Aul.* 88-90, 226-8, 825-30.

(8) Finally, lies are told with laudable purposes, or

with high moral justification. The most inspiring passage (and it *is* inspiring) is Tyndarus' exposition of his duty, *Capt.* 680-714. In *Pseud.* 430-2, the lie is intended to comfort a friend.

The recognition of variations such as these played on the rather stale theme of mendacity is pleasurable; but when all is said, the stirring use of the theme comes in those few "magnificent lies" of the *Amphitryon*, *Captivi*, *Miles*, *Mostellaria*, *Persa*, and *Pseudolus*, by whose immense audacity the audience is expugnatus. These lies cannot always succeed, but they never wholly miss their mark; and justly so, for their very audacity makes an accomplice of the audience, and carries the intriguer to his objective even when the intrigue *per se* must fail.

ORTHA L. WILNER

MILWAUKEE STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE

REVIEWS

The Local Historians of Attica. By LIONEL PEARSON. xii, 167 pages. American Philological Association, Philadelphia 1942 (Philological Monographs Published by the American Philological Association, Number XI) \$2.25¹

This book is not a collection of "the dry chronicles of local Athenian history"; the fragments of the local historians were collected in the *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* by K. and T. Müller, and they will be published, along with new fragments, by F. Jacoby in the third volume of his *Fragmenta der griechischen Historiker*. Nor is Mr. Pearson's book an account of method and style. The former receives consideration, but, because of the nature of the material, the latter cannot.² The emphasis is therefore upon content and the interests of the writers. The book is a monograph composed of separate chapters which are unified by a primary objective, namely, to discover the characteristics of the writers, sometimes termed chroniclers, known as the *Atthidographers*. Chapter I deals with the earliest *Atthis*, by Hellanicus. The *Atthidographers* proper are studied in Chapter IV (Cleidemus, Phanodemus, Androtion, and lesser figures), VI (Philochorus and Ister), and VII (on the *Atthis* tradition). Thucydides' place in the tradition and his successors take up Chapters II and III. In Chapter V Ephorus, Theopompus, and Aristotle are treated.

Of the *Atthidographers* (and in the handbooks the name is anything but glorious) said Mahaffy: "there is no reason to think that any one of them reached

such excellence as to entitle him to any attention beyond that claimed by the matter of his book." In the matter of their books Mr. Pearson finds the evidence of a literary tradition, and he presents this evidence with a tidy thoroughness that releases the local historians from a cover of ignominious obscurity. For it is the author's achievement to have shown that these writers (whatever the quality of their writing may have been) shared the interests and used the same tools as men who are justly more famous. The *Atthidographers* were not set apart on an island; they were carried along in a stream. This is true in spite of their almost complete immunity from the influences of the schools of rhetoric, and to make it clear, we need only explain that the study takes in Herodotus, since the *Atthis* tradition had its roots in Ionian historiography; that it includes Thucydides, who has a place in the tradition and therefore a chapter in this book, and Xenophon and Ephorus.

The qualities which the *Atthidographers* shared, says Mr. Pearson, are more generally known than the fragments of the individual *Atthidographers*. "When a conventionalized critical opinion has been generally accepted and the reasons for it have been largely forgotten, the time seems ripe for a new presentation and a new study of the evidence" (Preface, vii). There follows the author's brief definition of his subject, "a study of the characteristics of the local historians in the fourth and third centuries B.C.—the *Atthidographers*—as revealed in their fragments. It is concerned with their individual peculiarities as well as with the qualities which they had in common and with their loyalty to a literary tradition, the beginnings of which must be sought in early Ionian historiography." This definition, like the title of the book, does not adequately indicate the scope of the monograph, as the paragraphs above were intended to suggest. The definition of the work as a study of a literary tradition becomes clearer chapter by chapter, and is reviewed fully in the last chapter, "The

¹Copies may be ordered from the agents of the Association, Lancaster Press, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, and B. H. Blackwell, 50 Broad Street, Oxford. To members of the Association the price is \$1.50.

²But see page 124, note 2, where a fragment of Philochorus is quoted to show his style.

Atthis Tradition" (145-63). For these writers did not establish or carry on a tradition of political history. There is no evidence for a historical tradition in the fragments, but there is evidence for a continuous literary tradition through certain characteristics which the fragments definitely show were common to the Atthidographers, namely, an interest in religious ritual and mythology, in constitutional antiquities, in the topography of Athens, and (though evident to a lesser degree) in anecdotal and biographical detail. There is evidence, too, of a common arrangement of material.

The sections devoted to mythology and genealogy are not the most entertaining parts of this monograph, but it is necessary and also useful to have the several versions gathered together here with their sources. A rationalizing tendency of the writers in connection with the myths is a matter of interest for those who care to understand the reasons for this tendency in each case. It is probably a prejudice of interest that makes the fragments concerned with ritual and topography seem more important and more likely to make an enduring impression.

More complicated than other considerations is the method of dating, for the nature of the materials precludes the formation of clear-cut and dependable conclusions. Some observations that come out of the discussion, however, are the following: The chronological scheme of Hellanicus (for the earlier period outlined on page 17) was apparently followed by later writers, though this cannot be proved. History from some point in the fifth century received annalistic treatment by the Atthidographers, but there are no certain indications of the exact date their annalistic treatment began. Evidence for the annalistic method is available only for the Atthides of Hellanicus, Androtion, and Philochorus; there is a complete lack of evidence on the chronological method of the other Atthidographers. Several pages are spent in discussing when Philochorus, the most respected and the latest true Atthidographer (since Ister's claim to the name 'Atthidographer' is extremely doubtful), began to use the annalistic method. It is certain that he gave an annalistic account of the period of the Peloponnesian War.

Mr. Pearson is zealous in his determination to stick to his subject against all temptations. Again and again he carefully rejects from the discussion some topic that might conceivably suggest itself to the reader, but which has no place in this book. Such rejections are to be found on pages 29, 33, 46, 60, 92, 97, 99-100, 126, 155, and recur to the point of monotony, but they are symptomatic of a thoughtful and conscientious way of working and must therefore be admitted.

In this monograph the author has desired to make us familiar with the actual fragments of the Atthidographers, that is, with the evidence from which we derive our knowledge of their characteristics. Nevertheless it is the common characteristics of the fragments which

are left impressed on the reader's mind rather than the content of any of the fragments of the several writers. This is true partly because the fragments are translated or summarized for us, and we are not compelled to read them in the Greek (though many are quoted in the footnotes). It is easier to remember something general that is emphasized again and again, than to be really familiar with the content of many texts. The book will prove to be a well-stocked reference work and a supplementary aid for those who consult the standard collections of the fragments. In this connection, the specialized bibliographies appropriately appended to the sections on Hellanicus, Cleidemus, Phanodemus, Androtion, Philochorus, and Ister should not go unmentioned.

Finally, it may be said that this book contains some fine philosophy on methods of scholarship. And in a book which is written in a style that is wholly unimpassioned, there is revealing warmth where (93-4) the author defends the pride of Ephorus in his native city of Cyme. Pearson hints that this local pride was not peculiar to Ephorus, but was Greek, which is another way of saying that it was human.

ALINE ABACHERLI BOYCE

AMERICAN NUMISMATIC SOCIETY

La colonisation grecque de l'Italie méridionale et de la Sicile dans l'antiquité: l'histoire et la légende. By JEAN BÉRARD. 555 pages. E. de Boccard, Paris 1941

Les origines de la légende troyenne de Rome (281-31). By JACQUES PERRET. xxx, 678 pages. Les Belles Lettres, Paris 1942

Siris. Recherches critiques sur l'histoire de la Siritude avant 433/2. By JACQUES PERRET. 306 pages. Les Belles Lettres, Paris 1941

Genius Loci would have been delighted at the coincidence of two thèses presented at the Sorbonne under the German occupation. Both the authors treat the same subject, the relation between History and Legend as exemplified in the wanderings of the epic heroes from Greece and Troy to Italy and Sicily. Both handling the same material and following the same (historical) method of interpretation of sagas, they nevertheless arrive at opposite conclusions and refute each other in advance. For Bérard the tales bearing on the mythical founders of cities are quasi-historical traditions handed down from the Heroic Age,¹ although often in confused form. For Perret these tales are pseudo-historical inventions purporting some political propaganda; even their eventual correspondence with the facts of the mythic past may be only a mere coincidence (Siris, 209). For instance, the alleged settlement at Siris (at the Tarentine Gulf) after Troy's fall

¹ I have not seen Bérard's thèse supplémentaire entitled *Bibliographie topographique des principales cités grecques de l'Italie méridionale et de la Sicile dans l'antiquité*, Boccard, Paris 1941.

mirrors, according to Bérard (366) a "Pelagian" migration, while to Perret (Siris, 193) the story is only a piece of propaganda in the war for the possession of Siris (ca. 443 B.C.) between Thurii and Tarentum.

Bérard's book is divided into two sections. The first part gives a geographically arranged survey of Greek colonization in Sicily and South Italy from the eighth century to the sixth according to Greek tradition (45-316), the chronological reliability of which is confirmed by archaeological finds (284-316). Perhaps through no fault of the author's this section seems to add little of a factual sort to the pertinent works of E. A. Freeman (*History of Sicily*), E. Pais, etc. I am afraid his vindication of the tradition will hardly satisfy the scepticism of critics, because he rather harmonizes than examines the various accounts which existed in antiquity of the founding of Greek settlements. For instance, dealing in seven pages (121-8) with the plantation of Megara in Sicily, he takes no notice of the fact that Ephorus' account does not complete that of Thucydides but presents an Athenian invention destined to establish a link between Athens and the Sicilian Greeks (K. Hanell, *Megarische Studien* 1934, 117).

The second part (319-544) deals with "Legendary Tradition." The arrangement is here, so to say, biographical: Odysseus, the heroes of Troy, the Argonauts, etc. The attractive simplicity of this plan is fallacious. The author overlooks a topographical difference which should be of first importance in his research. While almost all Greek (and hellenized) settlements of Italy ascribed their beginnings to some epic hero, we can cite hardly any Greek plantation in Sicily as having the same pretensions. Even a mythical title of the Heracleids to the land wrested by their ancestor from Eryx (Herodotus 5.43) concerns a barbarian territory. Likewise, Segesta, Minoa or Hybla Geleatis, while said to have been founded in the mythic age, were indigenous places.

Then, grouping together all the tales related to the same hero, the author presents inventions with a political purpose, guess-work of local collectors and speculations of mythographers on a level with genuine beliefs and traditions. He accepts all this chaotic mass of discordant stories, even if he doubts their antiquity (374, 383 etc.) as a kind of imperfect account, recording the adventures and settlements of the heroes who sailed from Greece westward in the Mycenaean Age. On the other hand, Bérard places the narratives of Pre-Hellenic, "Pelagian" migrations from Greece to the West, as given by Greek historians from Pherecydes and Herodotus to Dionysius of Halicarnassus (455-508). Finally, he cites archaeological discoveries that point to contacts between the Aegean and the West at the end of the Mycenaean Age (508-24). Such convergences as these entitle him to consider the mythic tales "as reflecting the migration into Italy and as far

as to Spain of populations of Greece and of the Aegean in far remote times" (529).

Reduction of Greek sagas to history was practised already by Hecateus of Miletus, who transformed Geryon, a three-headed monster of the Labors of Heracles, into a king of Epirus rich in cattle. The same trend to bring Greek mythology into a fairly reliable history has come to the fore again. To take an instance from the Greek West, we can read in the *Cambridge Ancient History* (3.669) that there is no longer a reason for disregarding the stories of settlements of the heroes of the Trojan War in Sicily and Italy. But Bérard has the merit of working out in full and with Gallic clarity of expression the principle of this "Neo-Euhemerismus." So his book deserves an attentive examination. Naturally, to be fair, we have to admit the said principle as a working hypothesis. But we must ascertain whether its applications conform to the mythological evidence.

Bérard's discovery of which he is proudest is the historical key to personages of Ulysses' wanderings. Circe, Calypso, even the fearful monster with six heads, Scylla, that barked like a dog, are "Pelagians" (542). The Phaeacians are "evidently" (542) some Pelasges who went to Italy and returned into Greece. In fact, Homer suggests their non-hellenic character and tells that they came from Hyperia to Scheria under Alcinous' father. Taking the formula Hyperia=Cymae and Scheria=Corcyra, you see how the myth may be resolved into ordinary history.

Let us admit with the late Victor Bérard, on whose theory the author bases his own, that Homer has described Hyperia as Cymae and Scheria as Corcyra, although the localization of Ulysses' itinerary in the West seems to be Hesiodic (*Schol. Apoll. Rhod.* 3.311). But according to Victor Bérard Homer had his knowledge of the western seas from a kind of Phoenician Guide to Navigation. As the Phoenician trade with the West did not start before ca. 1000 B.C., one wonders how this Phoenician authority of the poet could help him to identify the vestiges of a fabulous people that had disappeared some centuries before the beginning of the Phoenician sea-trading.

In any case, the identification of Scheria with Corcyra, of Hyperia with Cymae (if Bérard's Homeric geography is correct) remains a guess of Homer and represents the historization of a saga of the marvelous mariners whose ships were endowed with consciousness and obeyed without a steersman (cf. C. C. Coulter, *TAPhA* 56, 1925, 49). Let us suppose that the tale of Prester John dwelling in the extreme Orient had a kernel of fact. It would be bad method to conclude that the mythical Christian king was the Negus for the reason that he had been identified with the ruler of Abyssinia by some writers two centuries after the first appearance of the legend in 1145 A.D. But Bérard regards the key which he boasts of discovering, the key

to a later (Homeric) methodization of the saga, as being the key to the historical interpretation of the (Mycenean) tale itself.

The same methodic fallacy runs throughout his book. The fabulous land of Aetes, the goal of the Argonauts, was placed even before Homer alternatively in the far West (Od. 12.69) or in Colchis (cf. Iliad 7.468). Probably the seamen's story of a magic ship sailing toward the setting sun was once combined with a fairy tale of a prince (Jason) who abducted a bride (Medea) from the far East (L. Radermacher, *Mythus und Sage bei den Griechen*, 1938, 199). In any case, Jason's adventure belongs to the East (Clark Hopkins, *Yale Classical Studies* 2.163), and his traces in the West are only secondary. Nevertheless, for Bérard they conduct us to "Pelagian" migrations into Italy (456). Digenis Akritas, hero of a Byzantine epos, originally belongs to Cappadocia; later the scene of his deeds was placed at the frontier of the Euphrates according to a changed political situation (H. Grégoire, *Digenis Akritas*, 1942, 116). It would be a fallacy to infer from this secondary localization of the tenth century that the emperors of Byzantium had fought at the Euphrates at the time of Digenis, hero of a skirmish in 788 A.D. Bérard commits such an error again and again.

Every saga is a very complicated body, composed of strata of various origins. The author of the *Digenis* poem has utilized, for instance, even an Arabian anti-byzantine tale to adorn the life of his hero (Grégoire, 140). The form-criticism of a saga is therefore the first requirement of historical interpretation. Take for instance the numerous deeds of Heracles in the West. The ancient mythographs classed these adventures as *parerga* that occurred to the hero in performing one of his twelve *erga*, namely, the abduction of Geryon's cattle (C. Robert, *Die griechische Heldensage* 2.2.428). Different from his *praxeis*, which Heracles did at the head of an expedition (the destruction of Laomedon's Troy, etc.), the labors imposed by Eurystheus are necessary single combats. How could incidents of a solitary journey to and from Geryon reflect the migrations of peoples in the Mycenaean Age (541)? The *parerga* of this labor do not represent "Pelagian" tradition. In the original (Mycenean) tale, Geryon was a monster living somewhere toward the sunset (M. P. Nilsson, *The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology*, 1932, 187). Whether his localization in Iberia be Pre-Homeric, as Bérard (423) asserts without proof, or due to Stesichorus (Strabo 3.148), all the western legends of Heracles depend on this rationalization of a fairy tale (C. Robert, 423) and are consequently only secondary inventions of local antiquarians.

Henri Grégoire's epoch-making research in the development of the mediaeval, particularly Byzantine, epics (cf. the study cited above, *Digenis Akritas*) established the fact that the Sagas are projections of doings and experiences of successive generations of tellers, all

shown together, as it were, on some one screen. The resulting image is therefore extremely confused. For instance, the *Chanson de Roland* about a hero fallen in 788 in Spain contains lines reflecting the expedition of Italian Normans into Greece in 1081 (H. Grégoire, *Byzantion*, 1939, 270). Generally, we may say, a genuine saga (that is, the popular memory of an event or of a person) cannot be reduced entirely to an historical record of this person or event. To the contrary, the first mark of a pseudo-legend invented for a purpose is its suitability for this purpose. The ancient kinship between the Spartans and the Samnites is not a saga (489), but a pseudo-tradition invented by the Lacedaemonian settlers of Tarentum to unite themselves and their neighbors together (Strabo 5.250). Ulysses' founding of Lisbon (Strabo 3.152) and Epeios' settling of Lagaria are not mythic projections of Mycenaean adventurers prospecting up the coasts of the far West, but only clumsy hypotheses of local antiquarians (for Epeios, see Perret, *Siris*, 274). We know how a Greek teacher of Spain once took some prehistoric shields for vestiges of Ulysses (Strabo 3.157). Antiochos of Syracuse, contemporary with Thucydides, expressly states that the foundation of Metapontum by Nestor's companions is only his inference from the observation that funeral sacrifices to the Neleides were celebrated in this town (Strabo 6.264). But Bérard bases his thesis on such ancient hypotheses and inventions as if they were genuine records of the remote past. Lactantius succinctly disposed of this method: *Primus autem sapientiae gradus est falsa intellegere* (Div. Inst. 1.23.8).

You cannot find fault with Perret as to credulity. His books are of different sort from Bérard's. He scrutinizes every scrap of text referring to the Trojan legend in Rome and tries to determine the source as well as the date of every evidence. Readers will appreciate his workmanship in the handling of modern methods of research, and will accept many of the minor conclusions of Perret. Let me cite, as examples, the reduction of the Trojan legend in Sardinia to an invention of Cato Major and Sallust (156), the proof that neither Sophocles nor Polybius, and probably no one before Livy, had related that Antenor went to Venetia (181), his explanation (256) of the related wandering of the Veneti from Asia to Italy as a conjecture of a grammarian of the fourth century who was trying to solve a difficulty in Homer (Iliad 2.851) and his reconstruction of the ancient history of *Siris*. It would be a good lesson in method to compare Perret's lucid and illuminating book on *Siris* with Bérard's treatment of the same subject.

Nevertheless Perret's main thesis is both arbitrary and improbable.

He asserts first that the Trojan origin of Rome is an invention of Pyrrhus, king of Epirus, and second that, with few exceptions, all other Trojan vestiges in Europe

are derived from the Roman legend. Consequently, all evidences of the Trojan wanderings attested only after 280 B.C. are regarded as artificial offshoots of the Roman fable particularly purporting to flatter the world power.

Surely, as soon as Italy was recognized as the term of Aeneas' voyage, local writers could not help discovering vestiges and relics of the hero on the route from Troy to Rome. I am wholly prepared to accept Perret's hypothesis (57) that a dozen of Aeneas' traces between Delos and Sicily were discovered by the diligence of Varro when he held a naval command in these waters during the war against the pirates. The ancients themselves relate that Aeneas' visit to Carthage was a poetical invention, which Perret (95) follows a suggestion of Niebuhr to attribute to Naevius.

But some evidences overlooked by Perret suggest that the propagation of Aeneas' saga is often independent of the Roman influence. Perret (52) regards as a piece of Achaean propaganda the sojourn of Aeneas in Arcadia, attested for the first time by Polemon the Periegetes about 177 B.C. But a decree of Pergamum of the second century (B.C.) speaks of her mythical kinship with Tegea (L. Robert, REG 1927, 212). Dardanus, the ancestor of the Trojans, was an Arcadian (cf. S. Eitrem in *Skrifter of Norske Akademi i Oslo* 1919, 2.151). Likewise, the foundation of Zacynthus by a son of Dradanus was a traditional belief. Thus a landing at Zacynthus and a call at an Arcadian place would be expected of Trojan fugitives. Aeneas' disembarking at Zacynthus seems to have been told by Hellanicus as well (L. Pearson, *Early Ionian Historians*, 1939, 189). As early as about 350 B.C. a man from Zacynthus pretended to be a descendant of the Trojans, "from the race of Cassandra" (RhM 1879, 198: I intend to interpret before long this important but completely neglected epigram). Moreover, the foundation of Buthrotum in Epirus by Helenus, son of Priam, is not merely a late invention under the influence of Roman legend (231). There was a place called Troy in the vicinity of Buthrotum and an inscription from about 200 B.C. mentions a confederation of the "Pergamioi" in the same neighborhood (L. Robert, *Hellenica*, 1940, 95).

There are some wanderings of the fugitive Trojans which are incontestably attested as believed long before Pyrrhus' time: the founding of Aenus in Thrace by Aeneas, for instance. Perret tries to find an exceptional, particularly a political, reason for each case. I fail to understand why and how the Trojan parentage of Segesta (Thucyd. 6.2) may be a "projection" of the alliance between the Sicilian city and Athens since 454 B.C. (283), but it seems that the author sometimes unduly stresses the political motivation in a myth. The Achillean pedigree of the Molossian dynasty is not an Athenian invention reflecting the alliance with the Molossian prince Tharypas after 426 B.C. (220); Pindar knew about 470 that the race of Neoptolemus,

son of Achilles, held the crown of Molossia (Nem. 7.38; cf. 4.51 and Paen. 6). Furthermore, B. G. Niebuhr's hypothesis, developed by the author (226), that about 375 B.C. the pedigree was extended by the addition of Helenus, son of Priam, as king of Cestrine, in conformity with a new political situation, may need a revision in the light of the epigraphic evidence quoted above.

But the greater part of the testimonies bearing on the Trojan legend before the third century B.C. are known only through later quotations. Here Perret's method is brutal. He considers all these citations as falsifications or at least as mistaken. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Syncellus and Festus tell that Callias, a writer about 288 B.C., ascribed the foundation of Rome to the fugitive Trojans. According to Perret (408), that is only a blunder of our authorities: Dionysius of Halicarnassus indeed says that, according to Hellanicus Rome was founded by Aeneas; this Hellanicus, explains Perret (368) was a Pseudo-Hellanicus, some scribbler of the second century B.C. But Dionysius adds (Ant. Rom. 1.72.2) that "the same account is given by Damastes of Sigeum." Our author replies (379) that the date of Damastes is unknown. But here he commits a fatal blunder. Damastes was contemporary with Thucydides (Dion. Halic. de Thuc. 5) and is cited as an authority by Speusippus in his letter to Philip II of Macedonia in 343 B.C. Consequently, the Trojan parentage of Rome was already told before 400 B.C.

How does Perret discover Pyrrhus to be the originator of the fable? Polybius declares that it was known to Timaeus about 260 B.C. Aristotle and (according to Perret still) Callias about 288 give to the Romans a Greek lineage. Ergo, their descent from the Trojans was invented between 288 and 260 (410). Although the force of this syllogism is rather doubtful, let us admit this period for the origin of the fable. But why should it, even then, originate with Pyrrhus, who was famous as a warrior rather than as an antiquary? Pausanias (1.12.1) relates that, while the Tarentine envoys in 281 B.C. were asking the king to assist their city against the Romans, their words reminded Pyrrhus of the fate of Ilion and he conceived a hope of success against the Trojan colonists as he was himself a descendant of Achilles. The incident, if reliably reported, would only prove that the Trojan origin of Rome was already believed at the time of Pyrrhus and was consequently invented before the fateful date of 281 B.C. But this is too easy for the *ars interpretandi*! We are assured (417) that Pausanias misunderstood his source and should have reported that, while listening to the Tarentines, the King of Epirus suddenly had a "revelation" (433) that he, descended from Achilles, was to meet in Rome the descendants of the Trojans.

The postulate behind this fanciful construction is the same which leads Bérard to his delusion. Both authors are fascinated by the historical theory of the sagas.

As K. O. Müller formulated it in 1825, this theory says that historical legends are created by a tribe about its heroes and are transported to other regions when the tribe migrates or even when a fragment of the tribe migrates. For instance, vestiges of Diomedes, king of Argos, are numerous in Greek Apulia because the land was settled by colonists of Argive lineage from Cos and Rhodes. "The legend expresses in its own mode a very real history" (4). Now, the Trojans did not exist in the historical epoch and did not settle colonies in the Greek world, and thus the presence of a Trojan saga in Greece or Italy comes to be a puzzle and compels us to discover an event which is (abnormally) reflected by the Trojan legend. The author grasps at Pyrrhus' expedition of 281 as the *raison d'être* of the connection between Troy and Rome. It seems to be for lack of a better, "the last chance, perhaps, to detect the mode of formation" of the fable (417).

Perret's discouragement is, in my opinion, premature and almost without foundation. Both premises of his reasoning are erroneous. The theory of purely tribal propagation of a saga conflicts with evidence. Roland, a Frankish hero, sung by the Normans in the battle of Hastings, did not become a national hero in England. But he became Orlando, the favorite personage of the Italian romances of chivalry, made popular as early as the twelfth century by wandering minstrels (cf. F. T. A. Voigt, *Roland-Orlando*, Diss. Leyden 1938). The Arthur Cycle, grown up around the person of a Briton at war against the English, was adopted by all mediaeval Europe. The Russian version of Digenis Acritas (twelfth century) does not serve to prove an imagined Byzantine immigration into Russia. On the other side, as the Trojans belonged to the most venerable and most widely known cycle of the Greek sagas, they were universally accepted by the Greeks as a portion of the common past. The Trojan parentage of Segesta or of Rome is not more puzzling than traditions and memorials of the Amazons in Greece (or Italy: Strabo 6.261) or monuments of the Colchians pursuing Jason that are said to have been found in Libya and on the Illyrian coasts (where Pola was, according to Callimachus, their settlement) or the countless vestiges of Ulysses, which are surely without connections caused by Ithacan influence.

The problem is propounded wrongly by the author, anyway; but in reality its existence is due only to a misunderstanding. Again and again he repeats (e.g. 212) that, while the Greek mythic heroes were carried to the colonies by Greek settlers, there was never a Trojan plantation in Rome to engender a Trojan myth. But the Trojan ancestry of the Romans is as little a popular tradition as the descent of the American Indians from the Ten Lost Tribes. Both are erudite hypotheses which are necessarily bounded by no tribal limitations associated with popular beliefs and tales. The Hesiodic Theogony gives to Odysseus a son called

Latinus. About 425 B.C. Antiochus of Syracuse ascribes to Rome a Sicilian parentage (Dion. Halic. Ant. Rom. 1.73.4); someone had advanced the Pelasgian theory (Plutarch, Romul. 1.2); other scholars, headed by Aristotle, regarded Rome as a Greek plantation; Hellenicus and Damastes referred her origins to the Trojans. Likewise the Iapyges in Apulia were regarded now as Cretans, now as Arcadians, and Tacitus (Hist. 5.2) knew of a half-dozen varied parentages attributed to the Jews.

The real problem created by these Greek racial theories is elsewhere. It is a threefold question. Why did Greeks crave the invention of Greek ancestry for Barbarians? Why did the latter accept the Greek interpretation of their national origins? Why, especially, did the Romans officially adopt and apparently prefer the Trojan version of their origins? To solve this triple problem is necessary if we are to make out the meaning of the fables concerning the origins of Rome or to reconstruct prehistory as understood by the Greeks.

Let me quote from Lactantius again: *Primus autem sapientiae gradus est falsa intellegere; secundus, vera cognoscere* (Div. Inst. 1.23.8).

ELIAS J. BICKERMAN

NEW SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH

Aeschylus and Athens. A study in the social origins of drama. By GEORGE THOMSON. xii, 476 pages, frontispiece, 5 figures, 5 charts. Lawrence and Wishart, London 1941 21 s.

The sociological approach to ancient literature is something new among classical scholars, especially in the United States. While in the historical field the same approach, notably under the leadership of Rostovtzeff, has yielded rich results, there still remain in ancient literature and art untapped veins for profitable exploration. Thomson's book is an excellent example both of the value and of the dangers of the method. It is the first work in a new field and deserves all the credit due such pioneering.

The book is divided into four parts, the first two dealing with tribal society and the passage from tribe to state in Greece, the third with the origins of the drama, and the last with Aeschylus. Thomson's findings are as follows: the art of tragedy is descended remotely but directly from the mimetic rite of the primitive totemic clan, with each stage in its evolution conditioned by that of society itself. The Dionysiac thiasos, from which the drama developed, was originally "a secret magical society preserving in modified form the structure and functions of the totemic clan out of which it evolved during the later phases of tribal society. Its principal rite, derived from initiation, had three elements—an orgiastic exodus into the open country, a sacrament in which a victim was torn to

pieces and eaten raw, and a triumphant return. This ritual was projected as a myth on the passion of Dionysus. Since its function was to promote the fertility of the soil, it persisted only among the peasantry, and so at a later stage became closely identified with the popular movement against the landed nobility." In some parts of Greece the ritual ceased to be secret and began to disintegrate. "The orgiastic procession became a hymn, which was developed most rapidly in the Peloponnese; the sacrament became a passion play, developed principally in Attica, where the popular movement after beginning later progressed further. From the first arose the dithyramb, from the second tragedy. Both were urbanized and consciously directed by the tyrants, the former maturing under the influence of aristocratic lyric."

Criticism of the book must be directed to its early sections. The appreciation of the art of Aeschylus is excellent and the statement of the social content of the plays, in particular of the *Oresteia*, is the first of its kind. Unfortunately, Thomson attempts to be too explicit and argues for certainty on uncertain grounds. The trouble lies with the anthropology upon which he bases his conclusions. These stem from Morgan's theory of a uniform development in primitive society, a view now generally discredited by more recent

anthropologists, such as Malinowski, Boaz, Benedict or Mead. As our knowledge of the various types of primitive society has grown, the relativity of their development becomes more apparent and it is a mistake of method to argue from the rites of primitive Australians to the existence of parallel institutions in Greece. While Thomson, following in the tradition of Cornford, is quite right in emphasizing the importance of the scanty evidences of Greek tribal life, he has been prevented from taking a more conservative and general interpretation of mythology by his wholehearted acceptance of dialectical materialism, which as developed by Engels and Marx used the conclusions of Morgan to oversimplify the picture of society's development. Although it is clear that Greek mythology represents the expression of thought among a race who were gradually emerging from tribalism, it is only in general and with great caution that such evidence can be used.

The primitive stages of an art are always fascinating, but, as I have attempted to show in *Myth and Society* in Attic Drama, they must be taken in conjunction with the later stages, where the facts of both society and drama are well established, if we are to gain a proper perspective on the whole development.

A. M. G. LITTLE

HOBART COLLEGE

ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES

This department is conducted by Dr. Charles T. Murphy of Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey. Correspondence concerning abstracts may be addressed to him.

ART. ARCHAEOLOGY

MILNE, J. G. *The Aes Grave of Central Italy*. The use of aes grave began not in Latium, but in Etruria, spread to East Italy, Apulia, and last to Latium and Rome. Aes rude, irregular bronze lumps, which Pliny states was the earliest currency used at Rome must be distinguished from aes grave, regular shaped metal pieces marked in units of weight, and aes signatum, originally metal stamped with a guarantee of quality rather than currency value.
JRS 32 (1942) 27-32 (Reinmuth)

MYLONAS, GEORGE E. *Excavations at Micyberna 1934, 1938*. Three mounds mark the site of the ancient port of Olynthus, 20 stades to the southeast of the city. Partial excavations of the largest mound reveals the general character of the town. The streets run north and south at a distance of 18 m. from each other; so far portions of only two transverse streets have appeared. The houses are very small and simple, in marked contrast to those of Olynthus, though the finds here are equally numerous and valuable. There are fragmentary remains of the pre-Persian settlement, which was apparently destroyed by fire, perhaps in 479 B.C. Ill.
AJA 47 (1943) 78-87 (Walton)

PRYCE, T. DAVIES (dec.) with drawings by Felix Oswald. *Roman Decorated Red Glazed Ware of the Late First Century B.C. and the Early First Century A.D.* Pottery of Italic and South Gaulish manufacture with detailed description of design and decoration. Beginning of the production of this ware assigned to c.

30 B.C., imitation of it by South Gaulish potters in c. 10-20 A.D. Italic pottery industry declined earlier than previously believed and was superseded even in Italy by the ware of potters in South Gaul, although Italian potters continued to export to the Eastern littoral as late as Claudius. Decoration of Italian ware was not naturalistic but conventionalized, deteriorating markedly during the first century A.D.
JRS 32 (1942) 14-26 (Reinmuth)

RICHTER, GISELA M. A. *The Drove*. One of the tools used by the sculptors of the archaic Greek stelae was the drove, a broad, flat chisel, which is in common use today for smoothing plane surfaces. Ill.
AJA 47 (1943) 188-93 (Walton)

HISTORY. SOCIAL STUDIES

HARLAND, J. P. *Sodom and Gomorrah, II, The Destruction of the Cities of the Plain*. Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed by a great earthquake, perhaps accompanied by lightning, and the ignition of natural gases and asphalt seepages common to the region in Biblical, Classical, and later times. Geological investigations by the Anglo-Persian Oil Company, the Standard Oil Company of New York, and the Iraq Petroleum Company (a subsidiary of Socony-Vacuum Corp.) indicate the presence of oil in Palestine, particularly in the area of the cities under discussion. Their findings are now withheld as being of military interest (the Germans know it anyway, having published the information as early as 1912!). If drilling for oil is successful, we may expect the Powers to be anxious for the job of protecting the Holy Land, although the holy places most likely to receive protection will be Sodom and Gomorrah and not Hebron, Jerusalem or Nazareth.
Biblical Archaeologist VI (1943) 41-54 (Upson)